UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,455	12/14/2000	Rafael G. Cabezas	AUS9-2000-0596-US1	1934

7590 03/01/2005

Edmond A. DeFrank
20145 Via Medici
Northridge, CA 91326

EXAMINER	
YANCHUS III, PAUL B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,455	CABEZAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B Yanchus	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This final office action is in response to amendments filed on 12/8/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert, US Patent no. 6,347,011, in view of, Lee, US Patent no. 5,852,544.

Regarding claim 1, Gilbert discloses a method for supplying power to a bus-controlled component of a computer system, comprising:

supplying power to the bus-controlled component from an integrated power supply via a bus connection of the computer [power from USB port, column 2, lines 50-54 and column 4, line 38];

determining whether the power supplied exceeds a threshold [high power portion requires more power than the 2.5 W USB limit, column 2, lines 52-54 and column 4, lines 20-29]; and

if the threshold is exceeded, supplying power to the bus-controlled component from a non- integrated power supply [battery supplies supplemental power, column 4, lines 20-29].

Gilbert discloses supplying power to the bus-controlled component from a non-integrated power supply if the high power portion requires more power than the USB can supply, but does not disclose supplying power to the bus-controlled component from a non- integrated

power supply of the computer. Lee discloses a system in which a computer power supply directly supplies power to both components located inside the computer and to peripheral components that are located outside of the computer [column 2, lines 11-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gilbert method to supply power to the USB peripheral device from a computer power supply instead of a battery located in the USB peripheral device in the event that the USB peripheral device requires more power than the USB may supply. Using a computer power supply to supply extra power to a peripheral device eliminates the need for a battery in the peripheral device and therefore reduces the size and cost of the peripheral device.

Regarding claim 2, Gilbert further discloses that if the threshold is exceeded the integrated power supply supplies power up to the threshold and the non-integrated power supply supplies any excess power [low power potion is supplied with USB power and high power portion is supplied with power from a power source other than the USB, column 4, lines 35-39].

Regarding claim 4, Gilbert further discloses that high-power components on the bus-controlled component are supplied power from the non-integrated power supply and low-power components on the device are supplied power from the integrated power supply [low power potion is supplied with USB power and high power portion is supplied with power from a power source other than the USB, column 4, lines 35-39].

Regarding claim 5, Gilbert further discloses that the device is a bus-controlled component [USB peripheral, column 3, lines 10-20] and the integrated power supply is a bus slot capable of receiving the bus-controlled component [USB port, column 2, lines 47-54].

Regarding claim 6, Gilbert further discloses that a power sensor is used to determine whether the threshold has been exceeded [column 4, lines 19-22].

Regarding claim 7, Gilbert discloses a bus power system for supplying power to a bus-controlled component, comprising:

a bus slot supplying power to the bus-controlled component [USB port, column 2, lines 47-54]; and

a bus power handling device for supplying power directly from a power supply to the bus-controlled component if a bus slot power threshold is exceeded [battery supplies supplemental power to high power portion, which requires more power than the 2.5 W USB limit, column 4, lines 20-29].

Gilbert discloses supplying power directly from a power supply to the bus-controlled component if the high power portion requires more power than the USB can supply, but does not disclose supplying power to the bus-controlled component directly from a power supply of the computer. Lee discloses a system in which a computer power supply directly supplies power to both components located inside the computer and to peripheral components that are located outside of the computer [column 2, lines 11-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gilbert method to supply power to the USB peripheral device from a computer power supply instead of a battery located in the USB peripheral device in the event that the USB peripheral device requires more power than the USB may supply. Using a computer power supply to supply extra power to a peripheral device eliminates the need for a battery in the peripheral device and therefore reduces the size and cost of the peripheral device.

Regarding claim 8, Gilbert further discloses that the bus power handling device [Voltage Regulator in Figure 1] is disposed between the bus slot [USB Port in Figure 1] and the bus-controlled component [Primary-Function Module in Figure 1].

Regarding claim 9, Gilbert further discloses that the bus power handling device [Voltage Regulator in Figure 1] is disposed on the bus-controlled component [element 40 in Figure 1].

Regarding claim 10, Gilbert and Lee do not teach a bracket for mounting the peripheral device in a computer case. However, mounting components in computer cases using brackets is well known in the art. One would be motivated to employ the well-known concept of using brackets to mount components in a computer case to ensure that the components do not move from their intended areas and possibly interfere with other components in the computer case.

Regarding claim 11, Gilbert further discloses a power sensor disposed on the bus power handling device that determines whether the bus slot power threshold has been exceeded [column 4, lines 19-22].

Regarding claim 12, Gilbert discloses a bus power handling device of a computer [voltage regulator in Figures 3 and 4], comprising:

an input area configured to receive a bus-controlled component [primary function module, column 4, lines 33-39] and an output area configured to be inserted into a bus slot that supplies power to the bus-controlled component [USB port, column 4, lines 31-32] ;

a power sensor that determines whether the bus slot has exceeded a power threshold [column 4, lines 19-22]; and

a power supply lead that supplies power from a power supply to the bus-controlled component via the bus power handling device if the power threshold is exceeded [battery

supplies supplemental power to high power portion, which requires more power than the 2.5 W USB limit, column 4, lines 20-29].

Gilbert discloses supplying power from a power supply to the bus-controlled component if the high power portion requires more power than the USB can supply, but does not disclose supplying power to the bus-controlled component directly from an external power supply. Lee discloses a system in which a computer power supply supplies power to both components located inside the computer and to peripheral components that are located outside of the computer [column 2, lines 11-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gilbert method to supply power to the USB peripheral device from a computer power supply instead of a battery located in the USB peripheral device in the event that the USB peripheral device requires more power than the USB may supply. Using a computer power supply to supply extra power to a peripheral device eliminates the need for a battery in the peripheral device and therefore reduces the size and cost of the peripheral device.

Regarding claim 14, Gilbert further discloses that the bus-controlled component obtains power from the bus slot and any power in excess of the power threshold from the power supply [low power potion is supplied with USB power and high power portion is supplied with power from a source another than the USB, column 4, lines 35-39].

Regarding claim 15, Gilbert further discloses that the power threshold is a maximum power allowed by a computer bus standard for the bus slot [USB has a 2.5 W limit, column 2, lines 52-54 and column 4, lines 20-29.

Regarding claim 16, Gilbert further discloses that the bus slot supplies power to low-power devices on the bus-controlled component and the power supply [low power potion is

supplied with USB power and high power portion is supplied with power from a source another than the USB, column 4, lines 35-39].

Claims 3 and 13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert, US Patent no. 6,357,011, and Lee, US Patent no. 5,852,544, in view of, Kang, US Patent no. 6,253,329.

Regarding claim 3, Gilbert and Lee, as described above, disclose a method and system for supplying power to a bus-controlled component of a computer system, but do not teach that the non-integrated power supply supplies all of the power when the threshold is exceeded. Kang discloses a device that only receives power from a non-integrated power source [self-power Vself] when the necessary power requirements exceed the limits of the integrated power supply [Vbus, column 5, lines 9-15]. It would have been obvious to modify the method and system taught by Gilbert and Lee to enable the non-integrated power supply to supply all of the power to the peripheral device in order to reduce unnecessary power consumption of USB port power, since the USB port power supply is not needed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul B Yanchus whose telephone number is (571) 272-3678. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Yanchus
February 23, 2005

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100